

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action dated February 22, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action"), having a shortened statutory period for response that expired May 22, 2006. A petition and fee for a three-month extension of time accompany this response, thereby extending the period for response until August 22, 2006.

Section 2 of the Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 6,505,042 issued to Hafiz (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Hafiz") in view of United States patent number 6,625,134 issued to Ji et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Ji").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "carrying out, in the mobile station, measurement of receiving quality of the perch channel in synchronization with timing of receiving the paging signal sent to **a mobile station group which includes the mobile station**" (emphasis added). Claims 3 and 5 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "paging signal reception decision means for deciding in an idle mode as to whether the paging signal transmitted to **a mobile station group which includes said mobile station**" (emphasis added) "by said paging signal transmitting means" (as in Claim 3) or "from the base station" (as in Claim 5) "is received or not by intermittent reception.

These amendments are supported by the specification. For instance, paragraph 0021 states as follows:

"the paging channel is structured such that multiple mobile stations are divided into a plurality groups, and paging signals for respective groups are mapped onto a single physical channel." (specification, paragraph 0021, lines 5-7).

That is, mobile stations are divided into a plurality of groups. Paragraph 0021 further states as follows:

"In Fig. 5, reference symbols PIs each designate a very short signal informing whether paging is present or not. Reference symbols MUIs each designate a portion including paging information (ID number of mobile station)." (specification, paragraph 0021, lines 8-10).

The mobile station first receives PIs of a group to which the mobile station belongs. It then receives MUI portions if the PIs indicate presence of paging signals. Because the mobile station finds destinations of the paging signals after receiving MUI portions, the mobile station receive MUI portions, whether these portions are addressed to it or not. The same discussion can be found in the paragraph [0142].

Paragraph 0022 of the specification states that "it is enough for the mobile station to receive only the paging of its own group" (specification, paragraph 0022, lines 3-4). This means that the mobile station does not receive all of the paging signals but the paging signals sent to a group which includes the mobile station.

The system described by Hafiz selects a base station to respond only when the system receives a paging signal addressed to it. A system disclosed in Hafiz receives paging signals sent from a plurality of base stations when the paging designated to the system exists. It responds to the base station that sent a paging signal with the highest received power. If it is not possible, the system responds to the base station that sent the paging signal with the second-highest received power.

The Office Action appears to infer that the system of Hafiz chooses the base station according to the received power of the paging signal and is therefore the same as the present invention in which the base station is selected by receiving perch channels in synchronization with timing of receiving paging signals.

However, the present invention relates to a technology for choosing the base station which the mobile station waits for (the base station from which the mobile station waits for paging signals) rather than a technology for choosing the base station to respond to the paging message. A scheme disclosed in Hafiz measures received power of paging messages transmitted from the base stations. This means that there are multiple base stations which the mobile station waits for and is definitely different from the present invention.

Also, a scheme of Hafiz is a technology to choose a base station to respond to when the paging signal designated to the system is received. On the other hand, according to the present invention, the base station the mobile station waits for (the base station from which the mobile station waits for signals) is chosen during a waiting operation regardless of the existence of the paging signal designated to the mobile station itself.

Although perch channels are transmitted from the base stations continuously, the mobile station of the present invention does not receive the perch channels continuously. Instead, it receives the perch channels only when the paging message (designated to the mobile station itself and to another station in the same group) is received (see attached figures). The meaning of the "group" is described in paragraph [0021] of the specification.

Accordingly, using the principles of the present invention, measurement of the received levels can be carried out at frequent intervals when a large amount of traffic exists and higher precision of cell selection is required. Otherwise, power consumption can be reduced by less measurement of the received power.

Ji et al. discloses that a paging channel and a pilot channel can be combined into one channel. Hafiz and Ji, even if combined, therefore do teach measurement of receiving quality of

the perch channel in synchronization with timing of receiving a paging signal sent to a mobile station group.

Section 3 rejects the dependent Claims 2, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hafiz in view of Ji, and further in view of United States patent number 6,628,631 issued to Mazawa et al. (the patent hereinafter referred to as "Mazawa"). Mazawa likewise does not teach the feature(s) mentioned above as being recited in the independent claims, but lacking from Hafiz and Ji. Accordingly, the independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 are not unpatentable over Hafiz, Ji and Mazawa. Dependent Claims 2, 4 and 6 are thereby not unpatentable over these references, either singly or in combination, for at least the reasons that their corresponding independent claim is not unpatentable.

Accordingly, favorable action is respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8th day of August, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/ADRIAN J. LEE/

Adrian J. Lee
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 022913